

REMARKS

The foregoing proposed amendment and the following remarks are in response to the Office Action dated January 30, 2003. As a result of this Amendment, Claim 22 has been amended and claims 1-26 remain in the application. The Examiner indicated that claims 1-21 and 24-26 have been allowed.

At the time of the Examiner's Action, claims 1-26 were pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claim 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner objected to the language "the delay between the synchronization pulse from the first satellite a time reference from the accurate clock determined at the receiver". Now the claim clearly recites an accurate clock sufficiently accurate to determine a delay between the synchronization pulse and a time reference at the receiver. The Applicant has amended claim 22 to more particularly recite the invention and respectfully believes it now overcomes the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The examiner objected to claim 23 as being dependent on an indefinite antecedent claim. For the reasons previously stated, the Applicant likewise believes claim 23 overcomes the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

An indication of allowability is respectfully requested. Should any minor points remain prior to issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

April 30, 2003
Date

Docket No. 7042-2

Pablo Meles
Pablo Meles
Registration No. 33,739
Akerman Senterfitt
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400
P.O. Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Tel: 954-463-2700